DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 691 EA 021 008

AUTHOR Sockett, Hugh
TITLE The Challenge to Action-Research.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Action Research; *College School Cooperation; Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Politics of Education; *Program Improvement

ABSTRACT

The status of action-research is measured in this paper. First, the political character of action-research is identified. Then, the degree to which differing versions of its character may be said to be political is examined. Argument is for the creation of a balance between the institution and the individual in collaborative activity. Examined next are the political challenges this creates for action researchers in universities as they seek to find an institutional structure to match their epistemology. Finally, the association of degree and nondegree programs with action-research in order to meet professional needs is discussed. Appended are 28 references. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307691

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
SAN FRANCISCO 1989

THE CHALLENGE TO ACTION-RESEARCH

Hugh Sockett

(George Mason University)

NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR QUOTED FROM WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hugh T. Sockett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 051 008

THE CHALLENGE TO ACTION-RESEARCH

Hugh Sockett
(George Mason University)

If Laurel Tanner's Critical Issues in Curriculum had a sexier title, a Madison Avenue agent and a more aggressive publisher than the National Society for the Study of Education it could have topped the best-seller lists and been read on North American beaches all last summer. It is learned without being heavy: impassioned with a mildness of style. It portrays critical issues in curriculum which is the heart of schooling: it is also a profoundly important social critique. It is more informed, more sophisticated and more readable on education than either Bloom (Bloom 1987) or Hirsch (Hirsch 1987).

George Madaus' piece on Testing (Madaus 1988) is the best sustained readable critique of the practice I have ever read: Herbert Kleibard's excellent and distinguished analysis of Fads, Fashions and Rituals is immensely informative and instructive. (Kleibard: 1988) Daniel Tanner has put together a most concise and erudite essay on Textbook Controversies. (Tanner 1988) Harry Passow's clear account of grouping and tracking issues should be compulsory reading for administrators.(Passow 1988) Gary Griffin, whose joint work in the late 1970s on interactive research attracted much attention, contributes a neatly sensitive piece on the School Principal. (Griffin 1988) Action-research, as such, is mentioned precisely once, by Henrietta

Schwartz. (Schwartz 1988) This is in the context of a range of things Holmes and Carnegie want teachers to become. Karen Zumwalt's examination of the extent to which we are improving or undermining teachers may be stretched to say that some action-research is implicit. (Zumwalt 1988) But apart from that-nothing. This book is thus something of a measure of the status of action-research within the field. Action-research may be significant, paradigm-shattering, revolutionary, crucial for teacher development, going on quietly in many places, and finding program slots at AERA annual conferences, but it is still very much a minority activity. It has been 25 years since Corey: but the advertisement pages are not full of professorial vacancies in action-research. Advocates of professionalism in teaching from Governor Tom Kean to Al Shanker do not naturally reach out for action-research as weapons in their armories.

The reasons for this apparent neglect lie in the failure of action-research to attend to its politics, to its institutionalization. At the outset, however, I should say that I have been working in the US for under two years. Maybe that will give me clarity of vision: it may also be that my vision will be too limited to offer much that is worthwhile. With that disclaimer, I will identify first the political character of action-research. Second I will examine the degrees to which differing versions of its character, drawn from McKernan's analysis, may be said to be political. I will argue here for the creation of a balance between the institution and the individual

in collaborative activity. Third I will identify briefly the political challenge this creates for action-researchers in universities as they seek to find an institutional structure to match their epistemology. What will be the place of action-research in the next curriculum handbook of major issues?

I

The political character of action-research

Action-research is a political program.

First, whichever version of action research we cherish as individuals, our conception still seeks to give teachers, individually, collectively or collaboratively, greater knowledge and thereby greater power. It seeks to give them status. It is thereby a potential political challenge to educational administrations. It is not yet seen as an imperative for administrators to provide; so, among many other things, teachers can't get 'released' time to do action-research. (Strickland 1988)

Second, it is also political in the context of universities, university research and research foundations. The dominant epistemology, which action-research challenges, is embedded in the institutional fabric of higher education and much else. (Sockett 1989) Many university faculty in education think the idea of teachers in general doing research to be faintly absurd. There is also, as Strickland puts it, a vaguely paternalist attitude in many universities to action-research. (Strickland op. cit., p 770) How can we expect faculty to spend time building a

culture with teachers to which their promotion and tenure criteria are unrelated? (Schlechty and Whittford 1988, p 202) How can we expect 'serious' journals to publish the stuff, especially if its written by teachers?

Third, action-research is out of synch with the political chronometer. Action-research cannot offer the quick fix. It is painstaking, long-term, and deeply transformational (at any rate, for some). Politicians want results - quick. They want the dropout problem, the drugs problems, the this and the that problem fixed, before 1992. You don't take up action-research with that kind of end in view. (Goodlad 1988 p 224)

Yet fourth, action-research or its methodologies have found a purchase in program and policy evaluation. There is not a mass-market there, but small groups of evaluators and purchasers engaging in semi-private acts among consenting adults. As Sirotnik puts it "...the community of evaluation researchers developed a small(er) but vocal contingent of advocates for more naturalistic methods of program evaluation." (Sirotnik 1988 p 173) This is political, of course, but policy evaluation is an elaborate 18th century duel compared to the Alamo of public schooling and higher education. Evaluators, like House and Stake, and Macdonald in the UK, demonstrate is that it is possible to use a action-research methodology within a tough political environment, and have it seen as valuable.

Finally the combination of these first three circumstances has been, and perhaps even now is a political mountain impossible

for curriculum action-researchers to scale. University researchers, anxious to respond to the quick fix orientation of the political and administrative power-brokers, work with traditional research methods. It may be true that we know more about learning, teaching and so on than our predecessors did in the 1940s, but the political imperative "What Works" drives short-term agenda for administrations, schools and universities and thereby supports existing educational organization. This does not favor professional development, as understood in action-research.

For the present system of educational organization in most of its forms is 'smokestack'. That is, it has long-established hierarchical management patterns, it is unable to incorporate new technology, it delivers a conventional product, (the raw material of types of citizen/student), it has complex labor-management relations, it is broadly uncompetitive internationally and is heavily reliant on traditional markets and marketing. As Derek Bok reminds us, in the case of universities this has emerged partly with the increasing complexity of relations with federal government. (Bok 1982)

What 'hi-tech' industry shows us is how much responsibility must be placed in the hands of the 'worker' - for creativity, initiative and the development of ideas: how bureaucracy must not be an end in itself, but kept to a minimum to serve limited functions. We need to understand a "'hi-tech' industry model" in education. That suggests new institutions, new relationships,

with a premium on individual creativeness and new model forms of accountability to match. Some of this is apparent in three separate but related movements: the site-based management experiments in the governance of schools, the broader movements for restructuring schools and the pleas for institutional renewal in school-university partnerships. Where teacher professionalization and teacher professionalism is taken seriously, it appears as an ideal couched in discussion of the character of the institutional workplace, school or classroom. That includes teacher 'empowerment', an ideal shared by curriculum action-research.

How far are universities poised to contribute to this political opportunity of the professionalization of teaching and are they supportive of it? Business can be highly critical of universities: 'it is ironic to note that many university educators give little regard to what is happening in the schools, especially public education, as if the nation's educational alarm need not be their urgent concern.' (Woodside 1989) Clifford and Guthrie have recently made a plea for changes in schools of education which may be appropriate but which are hardly systems-busting. (Clifford and Guthrie 1989) The Holmes Group seems, within a plea for standards and a restructured profession, to be intent on creating an in-group, advocating a policy of excision of lesser-breed institutions. Sizer's Coalition of Essential Schools and Goodlad's Center for Educational Renewal, on the other hand, are new models. As yet there is no coherent

alternative school-of-education-within-a-university as an institutional conception which resembles a 'hi-tech' model, nor are ideas for 'fused' institutions fully developed (see Goodlad and Sirotnik 1988). (Nor, for that matter, is there an equivalent model of a school.) Part of the reason may be that action-researchers and evaluators have yet to produce studies on university schools of education which might reveal some of the felt incongruities, tensions and inadequacies apparent within them. For the professionalization of teaching, I believe, has major implications for the structure, shape and conduct of schools of education which we have yet to come to grips with. (Schlechty and Whittford op. cit.)

To summarize. Action-research offers improved status for teachers, attacks the dominant epistemology, does not fit with political time-horizons, and is trapped in the vortex of the socio-political organization of education. No equivalent to a 'hi-tech' model of industry has emerged as an alternative to the university as 'smokestack', particularly in respect of schools of education. Without an institutional shift, responsive to the mood of teacher professionalism, action-research will remain institutionally marginal. It is important now to see that action-research has indeed a political countenance which needs to be seen as such.

II

A political typology of curriculum action-research

McKernan's comprehensive paper provides a categorization

which enables us to take the theme of the political in action-research further. Action-research, by definition in McKernan's account, seems only incidentally political: "The primary goal of this research is not to write research reports and other publications. Action-research aims at feeding the practical judgments of actors in problematic situations." (McKernan 1988) This loose-limbed definition is sufficient for the purposes of this paper: it can include action-research methodologies used in evaluation, curriculum development and research. It glosses over such sophisticated distinctions as that made by Elliott, for example, between 'teachers-as-researchers' and 'teachers-as-action-researchers' (Elliott 1988)

McKernan is thinking of professionals working in 'professional' situations, e.g. in classrooms, surgeries, courtrooms and so on. His classification is instructive: he demarcates the traditional, collaborative and emancipatory-critical conceptions of action-research. Stephen Corey is presumably a traditionalist, John Elliott a pure collaborative type, and Stephen Kemmis is in his own category of the emancipatory-critical.

What <u>sort</u> of classification is this threefold typology offered by McKernan? I am not sure: it is partly historical and yet he wants it to be <u>epistemological</u> defining in some way the character of a teacher's knowledge. Yet the classificatory terms are <u>politically</u> redolent. Discussing the course and development of any intellectual movement demands attention both to its

epistemology and its institutional politics. I will suggest that the typology is primarily political and it is necessary to see why to sustain my argument that action-researchers need to pay attention to the institutional context of their work.

Action-research in both the US and the UK reflects the broad political context of operation. The US does not see radical politicized intervention in education drawn from major political controversy - of the kind, for example, that in Britain has motivated the introduction of comprehensive education in the 1960s or the introduction of the 1987 Education Act. Whatever one thinks of it, an educational consensus of a kind dominates in the US, driven by 'fashions and fads' (see Kleibard, 1988 op cit) rather than political controversy. This is partly due to the lack of national centralization, although state legislatures seek to promote legislative mandates. It is also more open to parental intervention than European systems, which does generate controversy but only on specific issues, e.g. family life education. Public education also has a broader brief, as the diversity of curriculum in the US illustrates. Of course, conservative sentiments produced the accountability movement but this was driven primarily by an ideology of efficiency which did not provoke major political controversy, except in the profession. American conceptions of action-research do not seem to have been infused with a dialectic from across the political spectrum of thought: or, if they have, they have had to be muted if they did not wish to be extinguished. In the UK, on the

other hand, education has been part of the battle-ground between democratic (and other types of) socialism and the conservative right. Conviction politics replaced consensus when Mrs. Thatcher became Prime Minister in 1979.

For the purposes of this paper I will concentrate primarily on the 'traditional' and the 'collaborative' conceptions, though this will necessarily involve discussion of emancipation.

The 'traditional'

The core of the 'traditional' conception, in its prime in the 1950s, is described by McKernan as the 'era of cooperative action-research because teachers and schools cooperated with outside researchers by becoming clients in making their pupils and teachers available for research'. (McKernan 1988 op cit p 173) It was a top-down strategy, he remarks,'insulating professional researchers from the teaching ranks'. (McKernan 1988 op cit p 179). It is traditional in that the political organization of educational systems remained the same: moreover neither researchers nor teachers conceived it as being different. In universities researchers did research, and in classrooms teachers taught. But we must assume that Corey and his contemporaries were engaged in something they, following Lewin, saw as radical in theoretical terms yet they were traditional enough about institutions not to see the logic of the inclusion of practitioners as research partners which Lewin proposed. The radical character of the idea had yet to reach organizational form. It was a radical idea in a traditional political framework

of operation. But it is by no means simply a historical relic: it is a commonplace among those action-researchers starting out from universities on collaboration.

The 'collaborative'

The 'collaborative' movement, in which teachers, researchers and others worked in teams is picked out by McKernan as a consequence of the failure of the 'traditional' conception and is a growing feature of the mid-1960s and 1970s. This period in the US and the UK was that of 'the great epistemological leap forward'. That is, the development of case-studies using naturalistic and/or qualitative methodologies proceeded apace drawing on sociology, anthropology and their constituent methodological camps. On the institutional front, the gradual hesitant construction of links between universities and schools and the development of small-scale alternative structures also gathered slow pace. The larger context in the US changed fast, leading up to the installation of tough-minded accountability systems and in the 1980s to the moves for professionalization. Institutional collaboration was not perceived as one of those quick-fix solutions to which American education had rhetorically become accustomed. Rather it was something that many experimented with and a few, John Goodlad for example, perceived as a worthwhile idea whose time would come.

In the last 20 years, however, the notion of 'collaborative' has progressed from a weak version of the collaborative as 'interactive' to a strong version which heralds a 'fusion' of

collaborating institutions. The movement toward collaboration, weak or strong, has been supported by collaborative work in pre-service teacher education, but Clifford and Guthrie call for a 'fundamental reorientation toward the profession'. (Clifford and Guthrie 1988 op cit p 383) The strong versions of collaboration are attempts to develop an institutional structure which matches the epistemology of action-research in the same way that contemporary university structures match the dominant epistemology.

Sirotnik's recent thesis is an example of the strong version. Briefly, he connects research and evaluation 'under the rubric of collaborative inquiry'. (Sirotnik 1988 p 170) He describes the inadequacies of the positivist tradition of evaluation and shows how 'action-oriented formative inquiry' is especially important for 'internal program improvement'. He pushes the collaborative research paradigm 'to its logical conclusion by making explicit the inevitable evaluative nature of research in action in social settings." (p 174) He links this to the notion of critical inquiry, though he is at pains to disconnect this from any particular tradition or sociological paradigm. This epistemological logic he connects to the notion of mere collaboration (of a weak kind) giving way to institutional fusion (of a rather stronger kind). Whatever counts as fusion, it is clearly a political agenda for institutions.

Whereas the 'traditional' conception of action-research left everything institutional much as it is, the epistemological

evolution taking place as collaborative activities grew has clarified the political agenda - the pursuit of professionalization through major institutional change. Sirotnik sees naturalistic evaluation (roughly) as the tool and the embodiment of major structural changes in the school-university relationship. (op cit p 172-175) 'Collaborative' inquiry is no longer merely 'interactive', with institutions staying as they are but reaching out to each other: it is the activity of school-university collaborations which are moving from partnership to fusion (see Goodlad and Sirotnik pp 205-224).

We must therefore see McKernan's conception of what counts as collaborative action-research in its political, as opposed to its epistemological, guise as a continuum. At the weak end are forms of partnership, usually for specifically limited purposes, between existing institutions. There will be 'liaison' committees, the development of some degree program electives in action-research, researchers negotiating for work in classrooms, and occasional meetings between the leaders of schools and university departments or their representatives. The committed participants will form the residue of the relationship. At the strong end lies an unspecified ideal of integration or fusion, building from the notion of semi-independent consortia and toward the possibility of the alternative 'hi-tech' model professional educational institution.

What remains uncertain across this continuum of collaboration is the extent to which the individual or the

institution is the target of change, whether that individual be a teacher, an administrator or an academic. On the one hand there is a small-scale conception of collaboration whose focus is on individuals: on the other there is the large scale of institutional renewal and reform. Curriculum action-research seems to have been strong on individuals, but weak on institutions, in its collaborative mode. That requires further explanation.

The 'collaborative'; institutional or individual?

In the 'traditional' model, institutions remained as they were with researchers crossing the divide into the schools. At the weak end of the 'collaborative' model, some researchers began to see teachers as partners, most often in cases where teachers were also students for higher degrees. Along the continuum were a range of different institutions, i.e. 'collaboratives' set up to promote an inter-institutional agenda. These different sorts of collaboratives formed the context for action-research.

There seems to be an important difference of emphasis in conceptions of collaborative action-research. Crudely, one emphasis seems to be on the teacher as the occupant of a role, within an institutional system, whereas the other emphasis is on the individual person finding the way to interpret his or her role. The former talks of empowerment, the latter of emancipation.

What is the relation between person and role? Hollis makes a distinction between two conceptions of human nature which

influence how we see the relation between the individual and his or her role. (Hollis 1975) Plastic Man is basically molded by cause and effect: he emerges as an individual with an identity thrust upon him by a central value system, inducted into socio-economic relations and with drives and dispositions which are the legacy of the mechanics of genetic programming. Roughly, those who operate with Plastic Man, see him as constituted by his roles. Autonomous Man on the other hand is the self of commonsense, with privacy, self-consciousness, identity and rationality who selects and chooses the roles he will play. These conceptions are, of course, too stark, but the passivity of Plastic Man may be found in those whose perspectives are dominated by institutions and their constitutive roles within which individuals find themselves. Yet the notion within Autonomous Man, viz., that we choose the roles we play, seems false in our understanding of human conduct.

The relation between a person and his or her roles has to be construed as that of a "free social individual (who) creates his own social identity by acting rationally within a consistent role-set of his own choosing and becomes what he has chosen by accepting his duties as his duties". (Hollis 1975 op cit p 121) We can, I think, go further. While we may enter role-sets, rational human thought and action demand that we interpret, evaluate, criticize and reconstruct those role-sets rather than simply accept what particular authorities define as the legitimate duties. We thus can distance ourselves from our roles,

though we are partly creatures of them, but only that distance provides the space for self-criticism.

Focus on institutions will encourage us to mark down the significance of individual moral autonomy: focus on individuals will encourage us to place less importance on the public requirements of our duties and obligations. On the one hand we may see teachers simply as 'pawns in someone else's game plan', on the other as creative, untamed individuals working to highly idiosyncratic ideologies. But the power over individuals that institutions exert undermines the notion of professional responsibility, where the individual, within his or her role, is the locus of knowledge-in-action.

Sirotnik and Goodlad, as I have indicated, seem to me to be radical and imaginative in their strong conception of 'collaborative' though it lacks a robust sense of the individual teacher. McKernan, on the other hand, seems primarily concerned with changes in individual teachers and lacks the sense of institutional power. There are other examples. First, Schon's notion of reflective practice contrasts interestingly with Stenhouse's teacher-researcher. Schon reflects the ideals of Lewin and is focussing on professional education and its epistemology. Stenhouse is concerned with concepts of authority and emancipation and also with an adequate epistemology of practice. A teacher-researcher, for Stenhouse, is an individual person wrestling with the moral problems of role-occupancy and Stenhouse's commitment is to 'emancipation' from bureaucratic

tyranny (whether managed by school administrations or universities). Schon is looking at the institution of professional education, at the reflective practitioner as a role concentrating on role performance, not role interpretation.

Another example. Elliott indicates strongly that the major hypotheses which emerged from the Ford Teaching Project 'tended to focus on the problems of personal change in teachers (my italics)' particularly self-esteem, and my guess is that was indeed the target of the work. (Elliott, op cit p 46) Sirtonik, by comparison on the individual, sketches him or her as the enfranchised participant in a group process. Collaborative inquiry is about "rigorous and sustained discourse" in which individuals "say how they feel and what their own beliefs, values and interests are; and to participate in controlling the discussion." (Sirotnik op cit p 177) The individual here is learning what is needed within a role redefined for, but not by him or her. He or she is not a self-conscious critic of that role. For Stenhouse, group process was a tool of individual emancipation in the context of a struggle for power. For Sirotnik it is a tool of role enfranchisement, a matter of 'communicative competence'.

This difference of emphasis is no doubt a matter of an individual researcher's focus of interest. To some degree it is reflected in political infrastructures: by and large, British teachers have generally had much more classroom and curriculum autonomy (at any rate, to the present time of writing), and

British action-researchers have operated with that assumption. The American concern may be more with systems than individuals, for, as the system has moved from working with a conception of due process and away from a conception of in loco parentis, so the teacher's individual exercise of his or her role has been circumscribed. So, for example, in the complex area of Family Life Education, mandated curricula describe content and severely circumscribe the teacher's classroom actions: the teacher must represent the negotiated political agreement between school board and public.

Elliott's ideas for the self-accounting school are the closest British action-research has come to attempting an institutional construct. (Elliott et al 1975) Nowhere are there the programmatic experiments and proposals for institutional change in Britain to compare with those contained in Sirotnik and Goodlad.(op cit. passim) If some of the theoretical papers from British action-research are stronger in ideology and more directly political as well as in their emphasis on individuals, the American papers are much more powerful on the political implications of embodying action-research in the institutional infrastructure.

This distinction of emphasis between the institutional and the individual is important in education as it moves forward with professional aspirations. I have argued strongly elsewhere for noticing the distinction Hoyle draws between professionalization (as connected to status) and professionalism (as connected to the

quality of practice.) This distinction embodies the difference between the role (and its status) and how the individual responds to the development of 'best practice'. The notion of professionalism, tied to the quality of practice, puts the emphasis on the individual's obligations. (Sockett 1989)

As we think about the improvement of teaching, both perspectives are critical. I suggest that a comprehensive attempt at both professionalization and professionalism demands an attention to the emancipation of the individual and his or her empowerment or enfranchisement in new institutional organizations, perhaps on the 'hi-tech' model. The development of the collaborative model of action research seems to me to demand both, for without it we will not get the balance right in professional life. The question is how action-research can sustain this dual focus as it seeks to match institutional structure to epistemology. Sanger sums up one aspect of the situation clearly: "action research tends to empower individuals in their battles to improve their articulation and implementation of educational understanding with regard to professional practice. But dealing with institutionalized politics may be another thing." That is because too much action-research has not focussed on its institutionalization.

The 'emancipatory-critical'

The emancipatory-critical conception McKernan sees in Carr and Kemmis alone. It is avowedly political. I do not propose to discuss it at any length here, primarily because Steve Kemmis is

presenting on this occasion. Its emphasis is on individuals becoming social critics of their institutional context, not simply role-players within institutions.

One of the many issues the political basis of the 'emancipatory-critical' conception encourages us to address is articulated well by Burton who, as a teacher-researcher, thinks that university researchers regard people of his ilk as 'noble savages' in the research jungle. 'Whose knowledge is valued?' is, for Burton, the major question, though he does not see the critical dimensions of his question. (Burton 1988) Elliott and some other action-researchers have been meticulous in ensuring that teachers are not merely cooperators but collaborators in research and publication (Elliott 1988 op cit). There are teacher-researcher groups which have developed an identity and rationale outside a University context (Mohr and Maclean 1987) which enables them to retain control of their research practices and products.

The research 'community', in both its paternalism and its reward structures (i.e. its journals) is likely to place less value on teacher-research not somehow linked to academia. Marian Mohr is curt on this topic: "We resist the idea of classifying the research teachers do in some separate and special category not required to meet certain professional standards. Teachers do not 'pretend' to do research....." Such comments do not simply portray the political aspects of university-school relations. They indicate the significance of the notion of the

political structure for all education professionals and the ways in which institutional power can operate, even by inertia, to reject the value of external challenges.

The traditional conception leaves institutions and individuals much as they are: it simply introduces a new modus operandi. (see Carr 1989 for a critique of action-research and its aping of positivism). The continuum of the collaborative conception includes diverse institutional relations, but contains significant differences of emphasis, on individuals and on institutions. The significance of the 'critical' in action-research explicitly respects the teacher-researcher as <u>author</u>. Even within a 'fused' collaborative, teachers could still be junior partners, unable to take serious initiatives without the <u>permission</u> of administrations or only if they are in <u>partnership</u> with 'real' researchers.

III

The Challenge for Curriculum Action-Research

Action-research is a confident epistemology, coherent within a framework of professional relationships and understandings, even if it is still incoherent in some respects. (see Carr op cit) The broad political challenge is emancipation <u>and</u> empowerment, a focus on the individual <u>and</u> the role, within collaboratives which face the challenge of institutional renewal. Only through that process can a match be found between institutional structure and epistemology.

John Goodlad and Kenneth Sirotnik are the major recent

exponents of that need. In reviewing the experience of the past and the challenge of the future, they draw attention to the significance of leadership in innovations, the importance of creating structures which are temporary and open to change, the disparity between the rhetoric of expectations and the financial commitments of participating institutions, schools or universities. Questions of involvement, participation and representation have to be resolved, they suggest, on 'shared turf', and the creation of parallel programs (i.e. the new and the old) simply drain everyone's energy. We also need to be acutely conscious of the process of change and the quality of institutional and individual renewal as indicators of achievement. (Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988 op cit) There is no blueprint.

The challenge for curriculum action-research lies in the politics of institutional creativity. That needs brief pragmatic definition through some suggestions.

Action-research has not paid enough attention to the institutional fabric. Traditionally doctoral students are recruited, some graduate courses are started, brief smorgasbord courses on types of research tell of qualitative methods, and projects, more or less well funded, carry the weight of dissemination. Little pressure is put on educational administrations to create in-service opportunities which take into account the possibilities of action-research, or indeed to have proposals coming 'up' from the schools which incorporate

action-research methodologies.

The target is institutional renewal. Drawing on the range of issues raised in this paper, the principles of procedure necessary to work into the university psyche should include:

i equality in partnership,

ii attention to professional development of individuals,

iii 'shared turf' decision-making,

iv the acceptance of ephemeral structures and a long time-line,

v mutual institutional evaluation.

These principles need to be applied in the development of the three major areas

- o institutional structures
- o degree programs
- o non-degree programs

Institutional structures

The most familiar structure is the project: usually ephemeral, small, cultish, and hectic within short-term funding. The center suggests greater permanence, specialism, often marginal to the institution and thus liable to take off in a direction of its own unless its interests are directed into institutional renewal. The consortium is large-scale, with institutions as partners, not central to any institution's main task. Action-researchers have worked in all three, but none can create the sense of renewal on their own.

Each of these may be enabling structures: that is, there may be a developmental path necessary to follow such that a

consortium is built from a project, a center from a consortium and so on. Quite simply, any such existing or future institutions need to be reframed or framed within the principles. The assault has to be frontal.

Degree Programs

How far are degree programs matched to professional development needs? In pre-service programs students need to get experience of what action-research in their own classrooms would look like. It is in Masters programs that the opportunities lie: first for the degrees to be school-based and for work to be related to classroom needs; second for the programs to include introduction to action-research methodology as a natural extension of teacher thinking and third for recasting the traditional two-nights-a-week in more productive patterns, e.g. three annual three-day meetings.

Of critical importance is shared teaching on degree programs not merely to emphasize professional partnership but to draw on the real expertise that teacher-researchers already have. Formal inclusion in planning and grading are necessary, and to make the radical break with existing practice, the degrees need to be advertised as x university with y schools. Within such degrees, and within doctorates, it is important for classroom based action-research to be sustained over a substantial period. That suggests the development of internships in the intern's workplace. The imperative is the reorientation to classrooms and schools, and action-researchers should not just install courses,

but degrees with these aspirations.

Many teachers go to 'courses' to get 'graduate credit', a somewhat sad commentary on the drive for professionalization. Within the confines of their employment there is nothing unsavory about credit: the task is to use it to advantage.

Non-degree programs

Teachers go to in-service workshops; researchers go to conferences, sometimes. Radical review is needed of the character of all non-degree programs and the constituency at which they are directed. Academics badly needed activity-based workshops to enable them to understand changing classroom practice and perspectives. Support for Clinical Faculty is a huge opportunity for joint action-research on teaching in classrooms.

The major opportunity, however, is partnership with individual schools. The problem for the individual teacher learning new ideas and perspectives is frequently ostracism in the staff room. That can be negated if the whole school is the focus. Partnership focussing on school-based change and action-research stands a better chance of institutionalization. The creation of teams of academics and practitioners working in schools, in the service of the system.

These suggestions are intended only as indications of direction, for it is from the creative minds of professionals that the appropriate moves for their individual circumstances will come. Some institutions are realizing some of thee ambitions. Yet it indicates the dimension of political thinking

with which action-researchers need to begin to operate.

Yet these comments about what a university might do neglect the challenge for the profession of teaching. How cna institutional changes be put in place which 'fuse' the relationship between universities and schools? Can the profession use the movement for professionalization to examine radically its institutional structures? Can universities which have considerable authority support or lead a movement which will entail for the educational faculty substantial role changes and, in one sense, a loss of power and privilege? And how is this movement to be taken to the school boards and to the public? The challenge for action-researchers, who believe what they say about the significance of the practitioner, is to lock on to the political and institutional issues which continue to marginalize their practice and their professional aspirations.

REFERENCES

Bloom, Allan (1987) The Closing of the American Mind. (New York: Simon and Schuster)

Burton, Frederick R. (1988) Reflections on Strickland's "Toward the Extended Professional". In Language Arts 65.8 pp 765-775

Bok, D (1982) Beyond the Ivory Tower Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Carr, W (1989) Action Research: Ten Years On. In Journal of Curriculum Studies 21.1 pp 85-91

Carr, W and Kemmis, S. (1986) Becoming Critical: Education, KNowledge and Action Research London: Falmer

Clifford, J. W. and Guthrie, G. J. A Brief for Professional Education. In Kappan 70.5 pp 380-386

Elliott, J (1988) Teachers as Researchers: Implications for Supervision and Teacher Education. In Harvard Educational Review (forthcoming)

Elliott, J (1976-1977) Developing Hypotheses about Classrooms from Teachers' Practical Constructs: An Account of the work fo the Ford Teaching Project. In Interchange 7.2. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Elliott, J., Bridges, D., Ebbutt D., Gibson R., and Nias J. School Accountability. London: Grant McIntyre

Goodlad John I and Sirotnik Kenneth A. The Future of School-University Partnerships. In Sirotnik, Kenneth A and Goodlad, John I. (eds) School-University Partnerships: Concepts, Cases and Concerns New York: Teachers College Press. pp 205-224

Griffin, Gary A. Leadership for Curriculum Improvement: The School Administrator's Role. In Tanner, L,(ed) Critical Issues in Curriculum National Society for the Study of Education 87th Yearbook, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp 244-267

Hollis, M (1975) My Role and its Duties. In Nature and Conduct Proceedings of the Royal Institute of Philosophy, Volume 8, London: Macmillan

Hoyle, E (1980) Professionalization and Deprofessionalization in Education. In The Professional Development of Teachers, World Year Book of Education, London: Kogan Page pp 42 - 57

Kleibard, H (1988) Fads, Fashions and Rituals: The Instability of Curriculum Change. In Tanner, L,(ed) Critical Issues in Curriculum National Society for the Study of Education 87th Yearbook, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp 16-35

Madaus, George F. The Influence of Testing on the Curriculum. In Tanner, L,(ed) Critical Issues in Curriculum National Society for the Study of Education 87th Yearbook, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp 83-122

McKernan, J. (1988) The Countenance of Curriculum Action Research: Traditional, Collaborative and Emancipatory-Critical Conceptions. In Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 3.3 pp 173-200.

Mohr. M and Maclean, M (1987) Working Together Urbana, Il: National Council of Teachers of English.

Sanger, J (1989) Awakening a Scream of Consciousness: The role of the critical group in Action Research. Unpublished paper, Norwich City College, England.

Schlechty, Phillip C., and Whitford, Betty L (1988) Shared Problems and Shared Vision: Organic Collaboration.Sirotnik, Kenneth A and Goodlad, John I(eds) School-University Partnerships: Concepts, Cases and Concerns New York: Teachers College Press. pp 191-205

Schwartz, H (1988) Unapplied Curriculum Knowledge. In Tanner, L,(ed) Critical Issues in Curriculum National Society for the Study of Education 87th Yearbook, Chicago, University of Chicago Press,pp 35-60

Sirotnik, Kenneth A and Goodlad, John I(eds) (1988) School-University Partnerships: Concepts, Cases and Concerns New York: Teachers College Press.

Sirotnik, Kenneth A (1988) The Meaning and Conduct of Inquiry in School-University Partnerships. In Sirotnik, Kenneth A and Goodlad, John I(eds) (1988) School-University Partnerships: Concepts, Cases and Concerns New York: Teachers College Press. pp 169-191

Sockett, H. T. (1989) Research, Practice and Professional Aspiration in Teaching. In Journal of Curriculum Studies, 21.2 (forthcoming)

Strickland, Dorothy S. (1988) The Teacher as Researcher: Toward the Extended Professional. In Language Arts 65.8 pp 754-764 & 765-775.

Tanner, D (1988) The Textbook Controversies. In Tanner, L,(ed) Critical Issues in Curriculum National Society for the Study of Education 87th Yearbook, Chicago, University of Chicago Press,

Tanner, L,(ed) (1988) Critical Issues in Curriculum National Society for the Study of Education 87th Yearbook, Chicago, University of Chicago Press,

Woodside, William S. (1989) Private Sector Support for Public Education. In Bossone, Richard M. and Polishook, Irwin H. School/College/Business Partnerships Proceedings of the Tenth Conference of the University/Urban Schools National Task Force. New York: City University p 8.

Zumwalt, K (1988) Are we improving or undermining teaching? In Tanner, L,(ed) Critical Issues in Curriculum National Society for the Study of Education 87th Yearbook, Chicago, University of Chicago Press